granted without completing the formalities with regard to certification of its accounts; and

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor and what is the present position in this regard?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI): (a) Under section 10(23C) (iv) of the Income-tax Act, a fund or institution established for charitable purposes may be notified by the Central Government for purposes of exemption under the said provision, having regard to the objects of the fund or institution and its importance throughout India or throughout any State or States. The aforesaid provision, therefore, does not, in terms, require certification of accounts of the fund or institution as a pre-condition for the grant of exemption. However, as indicated in the reply to Unstarred Question 2427 in Rajya Sabha on 1st December, 1987, the Churhat Children Welfare Society, had, while seeking approval under section 10 (23C) (iv) of the Income-tax Act, submitted copies of audited accounts to the Central Government for the years specified in the said reply.

(b) Does not arise.

Incentive earning scheme for employees of Bhilai Steel Plant

1677. SHRI AJIT P. K. JOGI:
SHRI CHHOTUBHAI PATEL:

Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an agreement was entered into on 13.9.1975 in Bhilai Steel Plant, fixing the incentive earning of employees working in non-works department, at 25% and 18% with clear stipulation that this would be reviewed after 6 months;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the management has been reluctant to review the incentive earning of these staff for more than 14 years despite clear indication in the local wage agreement dated 15.7.1989 and now raised the existing 25% to 50% without any change in working condition while the 18% entitled to Ministerial employees has been kept untouched;

(c) whether the management is now insisting on increasing the working hours of Ministerial staff at par with industrial workers to 8 hours per day and 48 hours a week;

(d) if so, what are the reasons for this unreasonable proposal of the management in violation of the international rule; and

(e) what are the reasons for not raising the incentive from 18% to 36% for the ministerial staff proportionate to the rise of 25% to 50% allowed to workers?

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (e) On 28.3.1990, it was agreed between the management and the local Union at Bhilai Steel Plant that those employees in the non-works Department who are working for 8 hours a day and 48 hours a week and are in receipt of 25 per cent incentive will be covered under 50 per cent incentive rate with effect from 1.3.1990. However, despite efforts by Bhilai Steel Plant management so far no settlement relating to employees in non-works Departments (including Ministerial Staff) with working hours less than 48 hours per week who are in receipt of 18 per cent incentive has been reached.

Acquisition of companies by the Goenkas of Ceat Tyres Private Limited

1678. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the

financial institutions were aware of the various acquisitions made by the Goenkas in relation to tyre and ancillary intermediary companies of Ceat Tyres Ltd. *viz.* Malayalam Harrison; Bayer India Ltd.; Schrader Scovil Duncan; Phillips Carbon Black; National Standard Duncan, etc.

(b) if so, how was this allowed;

(c) whether MRTP authorities cleared these acquisitions; and

(d) what are the details of the role of the financial institutions in this regard?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI): (a) to (d) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House to the extent available and permissible under the rules.

Solicitors Retained by LIC

1679. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what are the names of the solicitors engaged by the LIC for various purposes and the period for which each of them has been on the panel; and

(b) what are the fees paid to these solicitors in the past three years under various accounts?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI): (a) and (b) The following solicitors/firms have been engaged by the LIC for various purposes from time to time. The Corporation has paid the following amounts for professional services in connection with the legal matter handled by them during the last three years:—

Place	Name of Solicitors/Firms	Fee paid (Rs.)
Bombay	M/s. Little & Co.	11,56,579.73
	M/s. Mulla & Mulla & Criagie Blunt & Caroe.	1,09,233.10
	M/s. Ardesir Hormus ji Dinshaw & Co.	81,782.20
	M/s. Matubhai Jamietram & Madan.	85,906.10
	M/s. Pyne & Co.	31,965.00
	M/s. Thakurdas & Madgaonkar.	21,400.00
	M/s. Bhaishankar & Kanga.	2,750.00
	M/s. Shah & Sanghavi	71,064.00
	M/s. Ambubhai Diwanji	15,000.00
	M/s. Pandya & Poonawala	874.00
	M/s. Muzumdar & Co	600.00
	M/s. J.B. Dadachanji & Co.	14,300.00
	M/s. Amarchand & Mangaldas & Hiralal Shroff & Co.	5,00,000.00
Calcutta	M/s. Fox & Mondal	62,373.25
	M/s. Pyre & Pyne	99,382.40
	M/s. S. N. Sen & Co.	19,914.10
	M/s. A. Ganguly	25,349.32
New Delhi	M/s. J.B. Dadachanji & Co.	2,74,094.27

Services of Amarchand and Mangaldas and Hiralal Shroff and Company utilised by LIC as their Solicitors in the L & T case

1680. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Life Insurance Corporation of India engaged the services of Amarchand and Mangaldas and Hiralal